

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-60 are the claims that have been examined in the instant application. Claims 1-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 9, 10, 27-30, 47-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-60 are allowable over prior art, if applicant overcomes rejections above.

By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claims 1-3, 6, 9-16, 21, 22, 27-36, 41, 42 and 47-50 and cancel claims 51-60.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the certified copy having been received.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for considering and initialing the references submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 1, 2004.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner indicate that the drawings are acceptable in the next Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner notes a number of informalities in claim 1, as well as claims 2, 3, 6, 10-16, 21, 22, 27-34, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 47-50. Applicants hereby claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 10-16, 21, 22, 27-34, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 47-50 in order to cure the noted deficiencies. Because each of the claims in question recites “at least one rectangular region,” Applicants submit that the term “the number of said at least one rectangular region” has proper antecedent basis in each claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9, 10, 27-30, 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants hereby amend claims 9, 10, 27-30, and 47-50 in order to provide sufficient structure regarding the recited program. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner’s statement that claims 17-24 are all directed to a distributed software agent, Applicants believe the Examiner to be in error as the claims do not recite a software agent. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is hereby respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-60 are allowable over prior art, if the rejections above are addressed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

Date: December 5, 2007